



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/572,700	01/10/2007	Matti Kalervo	915-001.081	4521

4955 7590 09/29/2008
WARE FRESSOLA VAN DER SLUYS & ADOLPHSON, LLP
BRADFORD GREEN, BUILDING 5
755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224
MONROE, CT 06468

EXAMINER

RUTZ, ANGELICA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2169

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/29/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/572,700

Applicant(s)

KALERVO ET AL.

Examiner

ANGELICA RUIZ

Art Unit

2169

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 June 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 and 16-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 15 and 23 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 and 16-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The Action is responsive to Applicant's amendment, filed on June 20, 2008.
2. It is acknowledged that as a result of the amendment, Claims 1-4, 9-10, 13-14, 16-18, and 22 have been amended and Claims 15 and 23 have been canceled.
3. Claims 1-14 and 16-22 are pending.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14 and 16-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection necessitated by Applicant's amendment of the claims.
5. Applicant argues in substance that Claim 20 "most preferable means" is clear in the specification, but the Examiner respectfully disagrees the "most preferable" is a relative term, and the specification mentions the "most preferable means of communication" as claimed only in Par [0045] and Par [0046] and they cited different examples as the significance for the mentioned phrase, and still not comply with 35 USC 112.
6. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re*

Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the secondary reference Reed et al (2003/0134648 A1) is added to exemplify the "search" included in the claim language but the primary reference Yared et al (US 2003/0149781 A1), conveys in content with querying the distributed network by the user's personal information which is an attribute for the user and can be search for their attributes.

7. Applicant argues in substance that Yared does not associate at least part of the data found in a search with a context as is disclosed in Claim 1, further clarification is shown in the USC 103 rejection below. Yared does associate the queried user with part of the data and according to the profile preferences the data is shared or not. As the abstract said the mentioned art "enable information sharing and aggregation".

8. The claims and only the claims form the metes and bounds of the invention. "Office personnel are to give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the supporting disclosure. In re Morris, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997). *Limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim are not read into the claim.* In re Prater, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541,550-551 (CCPA 1969)" (MPEP p 2100-8, c 2, I 45-48; p 2100-9, c 1, I 1-4). The Examiner has full latitude to interpret each claim in the broadest reasonable sense. The Examiner will reference prior art using terminology familiar to one of ordinary skill in the art. Such an approach is broad in concept and can be either explicit or implicit in meaning

Specification

9. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Examiner has noticed in the content of the Specification that the phrase “may be” is used continuously and some of the terms are included in the claims for example Par [0046], “...the terminal *may be* e.g a GSM or a UTMS...” which will leave claim 22 language unclear. Appropriate correction is required.
10. In view of amendment to then abstract, the Examiner withdraws the pending objection to the abstract.
11. Examiner agrees with the applicant remarks about the improper numbering, the pending objection to the specification is also withdrawn.

Claim Objections

12. In view of amendment to Claim 22, the Examiner withdraws the pending objection to the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

13. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
- The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
14. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

15. The term "most preferable means" in claim 20 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "most preferable means" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

16. In view of the amendments to the claims 1-3, 10, 16-17, and 22, the Examiner withdraws all pending rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

17. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior office action.

18. In view of the amendments to the claims, the Examiner withdraws all pending rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

19. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

20. Claims 1, 2, 4-11, 13-14, 16-18, and 20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Yared et al (US Publication No. 2003/0149781)**, hereinafter Yared, in view of **Reed et al. (US 2003/0134648 A1)**.

As per Claim 1, Yared discloses:

A method comprising: obtaining criteria for finding information related to a person or entity,

(Abstract and Claim 28, The method of claim 26 further comprising: determining whether the user profile data request is approved in a user policy; and responsive to the determining, sending user profile data to one of the first system entity and the second system entity.") and (Par [0009], "...Identity information includes attributes such as the user's name, mailing address, e-mail, telephone number, and credit card number. An identity provider is an **entity** that creates, manages, and stores identity information for a plurality of users....") and (Par [0064], "Service provider 210 then parses the embedded credential 235 from the URI and uses back channel communications to **query user profile data** 240 from identity provider..."), "attributes" being the "criteria" as claimed.

-executing a search in a wireless communications network or a connected network thereof in order to access data fulfilling the criteria,

(Abstract, "A distributed network identity is provided. An identity provider stores a portion of a user's personal information. A service provider **accesses user information** from one or more identity providers. System entities such as identity providers and service providers can be linked to enable information sharing and aggregation...") and (Par [0044], "In an embodiment, network 130 is a partially public or a wholly public network **such as the Internet**. Network 130 can also be a private network or include one or more distinct or logical private networks (e.g., virtual private networks).

Additionally, the illustrated communication links to network 130 and between identity provider B 110 and service provider B 120 **can be wireline or wireless** (i.e., terrestrial- or satellite-based transceivers)...”) and (Par [0068], “ When the **user navigates** to service provider 415, the service provider can redirect the *user’s browser to common domain 410 to query for the identity preference 435...*”) and (Par [0054] An additional mechanism for cross-domain communication includes HTTP redirection. Redirection causes a browser to access a different resource identified by a uniform resource identifier (URI) or uniform resource locator (URL). A uniform resource identifier (URI) is a string of characters used for identifying an abstract or physical resource. A URI or URL can contain additional information, ***such as a query parameter...***”), the query being the “search”.

-associating at least part of the data found in the search with a context, and

(Par [0118], “...A user may wish to distribute identity information among identity providers and associate the identity providers with distinct computing devices.”), the “user preference” to associate and distribute the information is related to the “user’s profile data is available to service providers”, which inherently is associated with the context, if certain user is queried the information will be obtained, query being the search as claimed.

And (Par [0047], “...by a user policy, for example, a calendar service can send a reminder to a user’s mobile telephone using the mobile telephone service provider. In

this example, the identity provider, the calendar service, and the mobile telephone service use web services **to interact or to exchange data...**")

- establishing a reachability information on the basis of the context.

(Par [0176], "In another embodiment, a user can specify the manner in which a service provider handles user **profile data and preferences**. For example, the user can select whether (1) the information is to be used only once and discarded, (2) the information can be saved and reused, (3) the information can be forwarded to another service provider only once then discarded, or (4) the information can be forwarded to other service providers with restriction. The identity provider provides these features for the user, either for individual attributes or on a group of attributes (e.g., a specific profile). Further, users can customize these data control for each service provider in the identity provider's user directory."), "profile data and preferences" being the "reachability information", this profile has the user's preference of being reached.

And (Par [0139], "...the user authorizes the portal to access the calendar...to distributed user profile data").

However Yared does not *specifically discloses* "search"

On the other hand Reed discloses the above claimed feature as follow:

(Par [0111], "Alternate embodiments to the invention include the ability for the hierarchy process for query (HPQ) to be programmed by a designated entity, person, or group in such a way as deemed appropriate by that party to ensure a desired search procedure. Additionally the hierarchy of user location method's used by the ULDM 904 could be

modified, appended, reprioritized or otherwise changed to use a plurality of location methods as programmed by a person, group or other entity to obtain any desired level of detail regarding the accuracy of the latitude and longitude calculations.”).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Reed into the method of Yared to take advantage of performing a search. The modification would have been obvious because one of the ordinary skills in the art would implement this to process the seeking of a particular file or specific data within a specific database.

As per Claim 2, the rejection of Claim 1 is incorporated and further Yared discloses:

*- wherein data, which is accessed by the wireless communications network, comprises **data elements** having references to each other, wherein at least part of the data elements are stored as distributed in the wireless communications network, a device connected to the wireless communications network or a connected network*

(Par [0054], “An additional mechanism for cross-domain communication includes HTTP redirection. Redirection causes a browser to access a different resource identified by a **uniform resource identifier (URI)** or uniform resource locator (URL). A uniform resource identifier (URI) is a string of characters used for identifying an abstract or physical resource. A URI or URL can contain additional information, such as a **query parameter...**”), all the identifiers being the “data elements” as claimed.

(Abstract, “...An identity provider stores a portion of a user’s personal information. A

service provider accesses user information from one or more identity providers...")

As per claim 4, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Yared does not specifically disclose:

- further comprises the step of visualizing the reachability information on a display of a device used for accessing the network.

(Par [0139], "The user browses to a portal that allows the user to aggregate the user's information from across all the user's identity providers and provides the above-described services. The user signs into this portal using a network identity...the portal displays...").

As per claim 5, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Yared does not specifically disclose:

- wherein said obtaining is performed by setting the criteria with a device used for accessing the wireless network.

(Par [0047], "Embodiments of the present invention include single sign-on, federated identity, and web services features. One skilled in the art will appreciate that the described features can be configured to collaborate or function independently or in any combination. As an example of collaboration, web services features provide a communication framework for system entities. An identity provider uses aspects of web services to service requests for XML data structures, such as user profile data. ... for example, a calendar service can send a reminder to a user's mobile telephone using

the mobile telephone service provider. In this example, the identity provider, the calendar service, and the mobile telephone service use web services to interact or to exchange data. By using web services, these system entities can collaborate regardless of the similarity or dissimilarity of the computing devices hosting them.”).

As per Claim 6, the rejection of Claim 1 is incorporated and further Yared discloses:

- wherein said criteria are utilized as search terms for a phone book of a device used for accessing the wireless network.

(Par [0043], “Example devices include enterprise servers (e.g., Sun Fire 15K, commercially available from Sun Microsystems, Inc., Santa Clara, Calif.), application servers, workstations, personal computers, network computers, network appliances, personal digital assistants, game consoles, televisions, set-top boxes, premises automation equipment, point-of-sale terminals, automobiles, and personal communications devices (e.g., cellular handsets)...”) and (Par [0044], “In an embodiment, network 130 is a partially public or a wholly public network **such as the Internet**. Network 130 can also be a private network or include one or more distinct or logical private networks (e.g., virtual private networks). Additionally, the illustrated communication links to network 130 and between identity provider B 110 and service provider B 120 **can be wireline or wireless** (i.e., terrestrial- or satellite-based transceivers)...”) and (Par [0092], “k) Logging into a Network Identity Using Non-PC Devices such as Cell Phones, Video Game Consoles, Set-Top Boxes, and PDAs.”), “phonebooks” is a well know feature pertaining to a “cell phone”.

As per Claim 7, the rejection of Claim 1 is incorporated and further Yared discloses:

- wherein during the search a first set of data found is automatically traversed through and at least one associated reference followed in order to find a second set of data.

(Par [0079], "In this scenario, the user has already "logged in" to a network identity-enabled site and traverses to another site that the user previously visited. In this case, there should be no intervention of the user to re-login and the user should automatically be able to use the site as long as the user did not log out or quit the browser session."). And (Par [0054], "...A URI or URL can contain additional information, such as a query parameter, to send to the destination...").

As per Claim 8, the rejection of Claim 1 is incorporated and further Yared discloses:

- wherein said reachability information is sorted on the basis of the context data.

(Par [0175], "Policies are used to define user-specific privacy rules that control how an identity provider disseminates user profile data and preferences to service providers or other identity providers. In an embodiment, an identity provider provides a profile service for the user in which different sets of user preferences (or attributes) are grouped with associated policies for privacy...").

As per Claim 9, the rejection of Claim 1 is incorporated and further Yared discloses:

- wherein the connected network is an Internet.

(Par [0044], "In an embodiment, network 130 is a partially public or a wholly public network **such as the Internet**. Network 130 can also be a private network or include one or more distinct or logical private networks (e.g., virtual private networks).

Additionally, the illustrated communication links to network 130 and between identity provider B 110 and service provider B 120 **can be wireline or wireless** (i.e., terrestrial- or satellite-based transceivers)...")

As per Claim 10, the rejection of Claim 1 is incorporated and further Yared discloses:

- wherein said associating includes analysis and selection of certain data elements from all found elements.

(Par [0118], "...A user may wish to distribute identity information among identity providers and **associate the identity providers with distinct computing devices**.").

And (Par [0176], "In another embodiment, a user can specify the manner in which a service provider handles user **profile data and preferences**. For example, the user can select whether (1) the information is to be used only once and discarded...").

As per Claim 11, the rejection of Claim 1 is incorporated and further Yared discloses:

- wherein said associating or establishing is executed by utilizing a predefined rule set.

(Par [0174], "7. User Profile Services") and (Par [0175], **"Policies are used to define user-specific privacy rules** that control how an identity provider disseminates user profile data and preferences to service providers or other identity providers. In an embodiment, an identity provider provides a profile service for the user in which different **sets of user preferences (or attributes)** are grouped with associated policies for privacy. For example, the user could have attributes such as "address" and "phone number" with...").

As per Claim 13, the rejection of Claim 2 is incorporated and further Yared discloses:

- wherein said references are in a uniform resource identifier form.

(Par [0054], "An additional mechanism for cross-domain communication includes HTTP redirection. Redirection causes a browser to access a different resource identified by a **uniform resource identifier (URI)** or uniform resource locator (URL). A uniform resource identifier (URI) is a string of characters used for identifying an abstract or physical resource. A URI or URL can contain additional information, such as a **query parameter...**").

As per Claim 14, Yared discloses:

- A computer program readable medium stored with instructions that when executed by a processor executes the method of claim 1.

(Par [0043], "...The program instructions can be distributed on a computer readable medium or storage volume. The computer readable storage volume can be available via

a public network, a private network, or the Internet. Program instructions can be in any appropriate form, such as source code, object code, or scripting code.).

As per Claim 16, being the electronic device claim corresponding to the method claims 1 respectively and rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejections of Claim 1 and further Yared discloses:

(Par [0043], "...devices include enterprise servers (e.g., Sun Fire 15K, commercially available from Sun Microsystems, Inc., Santa Clara, Calif.), application servers, workstations, personal computers, network computers, network appliances, personal digital assistants, game consoles, televisions, set-top boxes, premises automation equipment, point-of-sale terminals, automobiles, and personal communications devices (e.g., cellular handsets)...").

As per Claim 17, the rejection of Claim 16 is incorporated and further Yared discloses:

- wherein data, which is accessed by the wireless communications network, comprises data elements having references to each other, wherein at least part of the data elements are stored as distributed in the wireless communications network, the device connected to the wireless communications network, or a connected network.

(Par [0054], "An additional mechanism for cross-domain communication includes HTTP redirection. Redirection causes a browser to access a different resource identified by a **uniform resource identifier (URI)** or uniform resource locator (URL). A uniform

resource identifier (URI) is a string of characters used for identifying an abstract or physical resource. A URI or URL can contain additional information, such as a **query parameter...**"), all the identifiers being the "data elements" as claimed.

(Abstract, "...An identity provider stores a portion of a user's personal information. A service provider accesses user information from one or more identity providers...")

As per Claim 18, the rejection of Claim 16 is incorporated and further Yared discloses:

- wherein the device further comprises at least one of the following: a web browser, a search engine, and parser in order to execute said search or perform said associating.

(Par [0016], "...Each user communicates with the Internet 22 via a Web browser 32 or 42.") and (Abstract, "... In the illustrative embodiment, the attribute relates to internal or external nature of the search engine from which the search request originates...").

As per Claim 20, the rejection of Claim 16 is incorporated and further Yared discloses:

- wherein the device further comprises a set of policies to select the most preferable means of communication based on the context.

(Par [0174], "7. User Profile Services") and (Par [0175], "**Policies are used to define user-specific privacy rules** that control how an identity provider disseminates user profile data and preferences to service providers or other identity providers. In an embodiment, an identity provider provides a profile service for the user in which different **sets of user preferences (or attributes)** are grouped with associated policies for

privacy. For example, the user could have attributes such as "address" and "phone number" with...").

21. Claims 3, 12, 19, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Yared et al (US 2003/0149781)**, in view of **Reed et al. (US 2003/0134648 A1)** and **Parry et al. (US 2003/0061204 A1)**.

As per claim 3, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further neither Yared nor Reed specifically disclose:

- further comprises the step of executing an internal search in a device executing said method

On the other hand Parry discloses the above claimed feature as follow:

(Abstract, "Source selective information retrieval systems and methods... the attribute relates to **internal or external nature of the search engine** from which the search request originates. The system then retrieves information from a database in response to the request and the attribute. The information retrieval system is disposed at least in part in a computing system and the first source is an external search engine connected **to the computing system via a network**. The system is adapted to receive an information retrieval request from a second source, an internal search engine disposed within the computing system. The inventive system would typically be implemented in a computing system such as a Web server connected to the Internet via a network interface. In this context, the internal search engine would be implemented in software

on the computing system side of the network interface and the external search engine would be implemented in software on the network side of the network interface.”).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Parry and Reed into the method of Yared to use an internal search. The modification would have been obvious because one of the ordinary skills in the art would implement this to search into the device's internal database to search locally and save time.

As per Claim 12, the rejection of Claim 1 is incorporated and further Yared discloses:

- wherein rules for associating or establishing are received from an external entity.

(Par [0174], “7. User Profile Services”) and (Par [0175], “**Policies are used to define user-specific privacy rules** that control how an identity provider disseminates user profile data and preferences to service providers or other identity providers. In an embodiment, an identity provider provides a profile service for the user in which different **sets of user preferences (or attributes)** are grouped with associated policies for privacy. For example, the user could have attributes such as “address” and “phone number” with...”).

However neither Yared nor Reed specifically disclose: “external source”.

On the other hand Parry discloses the above claimed features as follow:

(Abstract and Claim 1., "A selective information retrieval system disposed at least in part in a computing system and comprising: first means for receiving an information retrieval request from a first source, said first source being an external search engine connected to said computing system via a network...").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Parry and Reed into the method of Yared to use an external entity. The modification would have been obvious because one of the ordinary skills in the art would implement this to use different components in order to perform a enhanced search to obtain accurate results.

As per Claim 19, the rejection of Claim 18 is incorporated and further Yared discloses:

- wherein the device further comprises a configurable rule set for a parser that analyses and creates the context from the returned search results.

(Par [0175], "Policies are used to define user-specific privacy rules that control how an identity provider disseminates user profile data and preferences to service providers or other identity providers. In an embodiment, an identity provider provides a profile service for the user in which different sets of user preferences (or attributes) are grouped with associated policies for privacy...").

However neither Yared nor Parry disclose the following:

"parser"

On the other hand Reed discloses the above claimed feature as follow:

(Par [1034], "The next elements listed in the database log are the elements that will be

tracked. These elements will be listed under categories in the log to allow rapid parsing of the log by software after it has been created and stored to a user's local directory of sectionalized portion of a home database structure. The categories are:...").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Parry and Reed into the method of Yared to use a parser to analyze search results. The modification would have been obvious because one of the ordinary skills in the art would implement this to break the data into smaller chunks so that an application can act on the information and save time to the user.

As per Claim 21, the rejection of Claim 18 is incorporated and further Yared discloses:

- wherein the device is arranged to receive rules for a parser from an external entity.

(Par [0175], "Policies are used to define user-specific privacy rules that control how an identity provider disseminates user profile data and preferences to service providers or other identity providers. In an embodiment, an identity provider provides a profile service for the user in which different sets of user preferences (or attributes) are grouped with associated policies for privacy...").

However neither Yared nor Parry specifically discloses:

"parser from an external entity"

On the other hand Reed disclosed the above claimed feature as follow:

(Par [1209]-[1228], "The next software component utilized by the DAN 8100 is the data interface software 8130. The data interface software 8130 receives input data in a usable format. The data interface software 8130 simply parses the supplied data and passes it to the DAN's 8100 primary logic software 8101...") and (Par [1229], "The external DAN query interface software 8135 takes these external sources and formats the data stream that both the data interface software 8130 and the voice mapping software 8110 use to retrieve information from external sources.").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Parry and Reed into the method of Yared to use a parser to analyze search results. The modification would have been obvious because one of the ordinary skills in the art would implement this to break the data into smaller chunks so that an application can act on the information and save time to the user.

Conclusion

22. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

23. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANGELICA RUIZ whose telephone number is (571)270-3158. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., ET.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mohammad Ali can be reached on (571) 272-4105. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Angelica Ruiz
Examiner
Art Unit 2169
/Jean M Corrielus/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2162